## AC

Rehab is inevitable. Absent Pell Grants, it will be religious rehab which non-uniques disads but doesn’t solve crime. **Lockard 12**[[1]](#footnote-1)

This is a world to which the recently deceased Charles Colson contributed greatly, one where true knowledge comes from the bible, the Book of Mormon, and a few other holy texts. The awards dinner featured a solid contingent of Colson’s Prison Fellowship volunteers. Organized religious missions have been coming to prisons since the late eighteenth century, when the Philadelphia Society for Alleviating the Miseries of Prisonssent mostly Quaker volunteers to Walnut Street Jail. Throughout the nineteenth and into the twentieth century US **prisons were sites of religious predation**, primarily led by Christian evangelicals. Limited efforts at educational modernization through **secular** post-secondary academic **programs came to a halt with the** 1994 **ban on Pell grants** for prisoners, legislation that had profoundly counter-productive effects. Colson’s growing success at **prison evangelization** programs **coincided with** the **gutting of higher education** opportunities in prisons. But despite enjoying a law career based on the advantages of an Ivy League undergraduate education, Colson disliked higher education as a diversion from spiritual pursuits. He had no use for contemporary intellectual debates, dismissing them as “the big lie of post-modernism” that distracted from rock-solid faith in Jesus as savior. In God and Government, Colson attacked the Enlightenment as a source of a mistaken understanding of human nature that led to a disastrous pursuit of social utopianism. He denounced universities as centers of moral relativism unfit to educate students who needed guidance toward moral authority. Colson’s vision of prison ministries corresponded with what he believed lacking from secular education – a Christ-centered path to improvement of self and society. Although he adopted the language of marginalization and oppression in describing prison inmates, Colson believed that address to the social origins of crime lay in spirituality rather than education that addressed the material world. Nowhere in his extensive writings does Colson engage with Pell grants and the disappearance of higher education from prisons. The politics that Colson advocated remained as deeply reactionary after his prison sentence as before. Rather, his experience combined with a new Christian evangelism added a coloration of social care that had been absent. His very popular and much-reprinted autobiography, Born Again, is filled with recounted political dialogue in White House offices and details of conversion and Christian fellowship found among Washington insiders. He views himself as an instrument in the Lord’s hands, unconscious before his downfall and conscious afterwards. “What happened in court today,” he said to the press after sentencing, “was the court’s will and the Lord’s will—I have committed my life to Jesus Christ and I can work for Him in prison as well as out.” The state, its institutions, and legal decisions in Colson’s view coincided with and remained subordinate to his own interpretation of Christian redemption. Born Again contains no condemnation of the lack of fellowship in Nixon’s racist Southern strategy, and has only praise for his president’s decision to bomb North Vietnam and prosecute the US genocide in south-east Asia. Ironically, it was the illegality of Colson’s obstruction of justice concerning a conspiracy against Daniel Ellsberg for his Pentagon Papers revelations about Vietnam that led to a seven-month prison sentence. In Colson’s version of his life story, his mistake lay in the hubris of ignoring God while in the White House. The rest of his life was repentance and corrective spiritual action, which he construed to include anti-Darwinism, opposition to gay and lesbian rights, and an array of reactionary causes. Another reading of Colson’s life is that he remained a faithful servant of the state, one who successfully advocated spiritual submission for prisoners rather than an education that would enable them to critique society more acutely and pursue intellectual self-reliance. The Prison Fellowship Ministries collaborate with prison administrations to operate a private-public partnership for obscurantism by missionizing a captive population. Such work with a domestic underclass recapitulates historic Euro-american imperialism’s combination of state and religious power to produce passive laboring subjects. The carceral state values narratives that confess sin, embrace salvational repentance, and advocate compliance with an ordained social order. Such narratives gain official sanction because, as Tanya Erzen argues, “Personal narratives of individual transformation are central to testimonial politics, and they work in conjunction with a neoliberal vision in which social services are privatized rather than funded by the federal government…Testimonial politics support the **faith-based policies** of economic privatization that **place the onus for solving social problems on the individual and** on the power of God to transform lives.” Colson modeled the compliant subject, entirely unlike the resistant prison narratives of Jimmy Santiago Baca. For Colson, a prisoner needed to learn social conformity alongside Christian submission. Prison was a place to ask questions only of oneself, not about society. Colson **did not challenge the massive growth of US prisons** since he served time in the 1970s or the role of the drug wars in fueling that growth. The entanglement of state and religion that Colson pursued resulted in a 2007 Eighth Circuit decision,Americans United for Separation of Church and State v. Prison Fellowship Ministries, which sustained a lower court decision striking down a state-funded Fellowship-run InnerChange Freedom Initiative re-entry program in Iowa prisons that employed Bible counselors and evangelical Christian programming. Although the Iowa program no longer exists, it still functions in Minnesota and Texas. Colson’s efforts to foster Christian evangelism on taxpayer money, a clear breach of the Establishment Clause, are withering. Where he has succeeded is in bringing volunteers into prisons to do the same work free of charge, where they preach personal faith instead of educate. There are social costs in ignoring the profoundly life-altering potential of higher education. Colson’s post-Watergate career was dedicated to a blinkered Bible-centered vision of salvation and individual transformation in prisons, a vision that attached no importance to a broad humanities and sciences education. It is a legacy that needs undoing.

**Thus the Plan**: The USFG ought to grant access to Pell Grants to inmates in the United States criminal justice system.

Funding through normal means. I reserve the right to clarify, so no theory violations until he checks in CX. No legal violations link because affirming means amending the laws to make the aff world consistent with them.

**Aff gets RVIs** on I meets and counter-interps because

(a) 1AR timeskew means I can’t cover theory and still have a fair shot on substance.

(b) no risk theory would give neg a free source of no risk offense which allows him to moot the AC.

Refusal to concede to my interp pre-round triggers the RVI because it skewed my AC by forcing me to read theory preempts.

Advantage 1 is Crime

Pell Grants rehabilitate prisoners which solves crime and poverty. Empirics prove. **Buzzini 9**[[2]](#footnote-2)

[Brackets in original text] It’s no secret that the education system in the United States is in shambles – and not just for inmates. Students aren’t receiving a proper education, which encourages the nation’s youth to get involved in gangs, drugs, and violence. **Many inmates can’t** even **read well, ranking** in **at** “maybe a **seventh-grade level**” (Leder 1). **Were it possible** for inmates **to receive a**n education while serving time (a GED if an equivalent had not been attained, followed by a post-secondary **degree**) **they would have a much greater chance of escaping** the clutches of **poverty and** their ties to **illegal activity when** they are **released** back into society. This must have been the line of thinking that inspired the inception of the first post-secondary correctional education program, which began in 1953 at the University of Southern Illinois in Menard. Such a program must have been a bit ahead of its time, because **by 1965 only 11** more post-secondary correctional **education** (PCSE) **programs appeared.** 19**65** was a landmark year for PCSE it **marked the first** time that inmates were eligible to receive **Pell Grants** to fund their college aspirations. **Thanks to** the availability of **federal funding, programs began popping up nationwide.** In 1973 there were 182 programs; by 1982 there were 350. Programs reached their peak when, **in the** early 19**90s, there were** a total of **772** on-site college programs **in 1,287 prisons** (Taylor “Pell Grants” 2). **The majority of inmates covered their costs with** the aid of **the Pell Grant. However, in** 19**94, thanks to** the prevailing **“tough on crime” attitude** of the time, **inmates** were **no longer** able to **receive** federal aid in the form of **Pell Grants.** While peak enrollment in PCSE programs totaled at 12 percent of inmate populations, the s0-called “deteriorated state” counted less than 4 percent (Taylor “Pell Grants” 3). There is **myriad statistical data** to **show that education programs** inside prisons **aid in** actual **rehab**ilitation **and** do **reduce recidivism** rates. But these facts were glossed over as politicians wowed their constituents with their tough policies regarding crime. However, they didn’t bother to mention to their constituents that “**Massachusetts, Maryland, and New York** are among the states [that **reported**] **reductions in recidivism of** as high as **15.5 percent for inmates** who participated **in education programs** (Freedman 6).” That 15.5 percent reduction means 15.5 percent of inmates were *actually* rehabilitated, as opposed to merely punished, during their time on the inside. The numbers are even more impressive on a national scale, as “**inmates with** at least two years of **college had a 10 percent re-arrest rate; the national average is 60 percent**” (“Statehouses Debate…”). That means 50 percent less people went back to prison, simply because they completed some form of higher education. It is for reasons such as this that “critics lament the loss of **Pell Grants** as short-sighted in light of studies documenting **lower recidivism** and misconduct rates among inmates who pursue post-secondary education” (Freedman 8). It truly is a serious loss, for the depletion of funding via Pell Grants for PSCE has resulted in a devastating loss of programs nationwide, despite such programs’ ability to reduce recidivism **and** markedly **rehabilitate** many **inmates who participate.** Should the Pell Grant be re-instated, corrections in America would see a much-needed turn for the better.

Poverty causes nuclear war. **Caldwell 03**[[3]](#footnote-3)

It would appear that global nuclear war will happen very soon, for two main reasons, alluded to above. First, human poverty and misery are [is] increasing at an incredible rate. There are now three billion more desperately poor people on the planet than there were just forty years ago. **Despite decades of industrial development, the number of** wretchedly **poor people continues to soar.** The pressure for war mounts as the population explodes. Second, **war is motivated by** resource scarcity -- **the desire of one group to acquire the land, water, energy, or other resources possessed by another.** **With each passing year, crowding and misery increase, raising the motivation for war to higher levels.**

Crime kills the economy. **AP 8** writes[[4]](#footnote-4)

**The U**nited **S**tates **leads the world in economic loss from death**s **caused by armed crime**, according to a global survey released Friday. The United States registered an estimated loss of up to $45.1 billion in terms of economic productivity because of violent crimes, said the report by the U.N. Development Program and the Geneva-based Small Arms Survey. At least **490,000** people **are killed in armed crimes each year** worldwide, **placing a huge economic cost** and social burden **on nations**, the report said. The report did not give a country-by-country breakdown of the numbers of people killed in armed crimes. But the report said that Colombia, El Salvador, Guatemala, Jamaica and South Africa are among the countries with the highest numbers of recorded violent crimes in the world. More people are killed worldwide in violent crimes every year than in wars, it said, asserting that the phenomenon of armed killings and its economic impact on nations is largely underreported. In the 90 countries surveyed, **the economic cost from people killed by arms each year** is estimated to **total[s]** between **$95 billion** and $163 billion, according to the report. "These estimates are based on calculations of the 'lost product' that is represented by premature deaths from armed violence," said Achim Wennmann of the Small Arms Survey."These people — had they lived — would have contributed as any other individual as productive members of society. Their deaths represent a loss that can be quantified," he told The Associated Press. The cost arising from these deaths includes a wide range of expenses from medical care, legal proceedings, and lost earnings to lost investment, the 162-page report said. Wennmann said the report was based on figures compiled by international organizations and national authorities. The most recent available statistics from all the 90 countries surveyed were from 2004, said Wennmann, one of the editors of the report. He said they had more recent statistics from North America. In 2007, the region lost up to $46.76 billion from armed violence, he said. The vast majority of that loss — up to $44.8 billion — occurred in the United States, said Wennmann.

Economic crisis causes nuclear war. **Royal 10**[[5]](#footnote-5)

Less intuitive is how periods of economic decline may increase the likelihood of external conflict. Political science literature has contributed a moderate degree of attention to the impact of economic decline and the security and defense behavior of interdependent states. Research in this vein has been considered at systemic, dyadic and national levels. Several notable contributions follow. First, on the systemic level, Pollins (2008) advances **Modelski and Thompson**’s (1996) work on leadership cycle theory, **find**ing **that** rhythms in the global economy are associated with the rise and fall of a pre-eminent power and the often bloody transition from one pre-eminent leader to the next. As such, exogenous **shocks** such as economic crises could **usher in a redistribution of** relative **power** (see also Gilpin, 1981) that leads to uncertainty about power balances, **increasing** the risk of **miscalculation** (Fearon 1995). Alternatively, even a relatively certain redistribution of power could lead to a permissive environment for conflicts as **a rising power may** seek to **challenge a declining power** (Werner, 1999). Separately, Pollins (1996) also shows that global economic cycles combined with parallel leadership cycles impact the likelihood of conflict among major, medium and small powers, although he suggests that the causes and connections between global economic conditions and security conditions remains unknown. Second, on a dyadic level, Copeland’s (1996, 2000) theory of trade expectations suggest that “future expectation of trade” is a significant variable in understanding economic conditions and security behavior of states. He argues that interdependent states are likely to gain pacific benefits from trade so long as they have an optimistic view of future trade relations. However, **if** the **expectations of future trade decline**, particularly for difficult to replace item such as energy resources, the likelihood for **conflict increases**, as states will be inclined to use force to gain access to those resources. Crises could potentially be the trigger for decreased trade expectations either on its own or because it triggers protectionist moves by interdependent states. Third, others have considered the link between economic decline and external armed conflict at a national level. Blomberg and Hess (2002) find a strong correlation between internal conflict and external conflict, particularly during periods of economic downturn. They write, The linkages between internal and external conflict and prosperity are strong and mutually reinforcing. Economic conflict tends to spawn internal conflict, which in turn returns the favor. Moreover, the presence of a recession tends to amplify the extent to which international and external conflicts self-reinforce each other. (Blomberg and Hess, 2002, p. 89) Economic **decline has also been linked with** an increase in the likelihood of **terrorism** (Blomberg, Hess and Weerapana, 2004), which has the capacity to spill across borders and lead to external tensions. Furthermore, crises generally reduce the popularity of a sitting government. “Diversionary theory” suggests that, when facing unpopularity arising from economic decline, sitting **governments have** increased **incentive**s **to fabricate** external military **conflict**s **to create a “rally around the flag” effect**. Wang (1996), DeRouen (1995) and Blomberg, Hess and Thacker (2006) find supporting evidence showing that economic decline and use of force are at least indirectly correlated. Gelpi (1997), Miller (1999), and Kisangani and Pickering (2009) suggest that the tendency towards diversionary tactics are greater for democratic states than autocratic states due to the fact the democratic leaders are generally more susceptible to being removed from office due to lack of domestic support. De DeRouen (2000) has provided evidence showing that periods of weak economic performance in the United States and thus weak Presidential popularity are statically linked to an increase in the use of force. In summary, recent economic scholarship positively correlates economic integration with an increase in the frequency of economic crises, whereas political science scholarship links economic decline with external conflict at systemic, dyadic and national levels. This implied connection between integration, crises and armed conflict has not featured prominently in economic-security debate and deserves more attention. This observation is not contradictory to other perspectives that link economic interdependence with a decrease in the likelihood of external conflict, such as those mentioned in the first paragraph of this chapter. Those studies tend to focus on dyadic interdependence instead of global interdependence and do not specifically consider the occurrence of and conditions created by economic crises. As such the view presented here should be considered ancillary to those views.

Advantage 2 is Science Diplomacy

US economic competitiveness is declining now due to lack of skilled workers. Specifically, our tech industry is lagging, and investment in education is key.

**Cooper et al. 12**[[6]](#footnote-6)

**The** U.S. **economy is weakening relative to our global competitors.** Recent economic growth is 40 percent below any other growth period since World War II as other economies around the globe draw in more investment, both foreign and domestic. In contrast, despite still being the world’s leading recipient of direct foreign investment, business investment overall in the United States between 2001 and 2007 was the slowest in U.S. history. Meanwhile, competition is on the rise. From 1980 to 2011 **China increased** its share of world economic **output** from 2 percent to 14 percent. **And India more than doubled** its output during that period, from 2.5 percent of global production to 5.7 percent. The U.S. share of the world economy fell to 19 percent from 25 percent. While increasing global competition is inevitable, lackluster U.S. performance need not be. Indeed, rising growth and incomes in other countries present potential new opportunities and markets for American workers and companies. But if the United States means to continue to lead the world and to share our prosperity with it, U.S. **policymakers must deploy** an American strategy that is responsive to modern economic challenges—a strategy that makes it possible for every American family to ensure that children entering adulthood are prepared to find a successful place in the global economy. What should the strategy be? Economists of all stripes point to **a robust pipeline of skilled workers** as the essential ingredient of a strong and growing economy. Indeed, the two countries most rapidly gaining on the United States in terms of economic competitiveness—**China and India**—**have ambitious national strategies of** investing and **promoting** improved **education**al outcomes for children to strengthen their positions as contenders in the global economy. This is obviously a sweeping and complex topic, which we document in detail in the main pages of this report. But here is a brief summary of the report’s findings and recommendations. The U.S. competitiveness problem and the case for investing in children Competition from rapidly growing countries such as China and India are changing business norms and the links between national economies. We are quite familiar with what economists call “global labor arbitrage,” the substitution of high-wage workers in advanced economy countries with low-wage workers in developing economies. That’s led to a global re-ordering of production, jobs, and growth. More recently, **tech**nological **advances** in telecommunications and transportation, as well as **[and] skills development in the developing world**, are **drag**ging more **U.S. industries—including computer** programming, **high-tech** manufacturing, **and service sectors—into international competition.** This development is feeding a mounting demand for high-skilled labor around the world. To position the United States for the future, substantial investments are needed in research, infrastructure, and education. The most important of these areas to address is education. Why? Because as this report shows, the **overwhelming** economic **evidence points to education**—and human capital investments, generally—**as the key driver**s **of** economic **competitiveness in the long term.** Harvard University economist Gregory Mankiw, for example, has shown that **in** advanced countries such as **the U**nited **S**tates, **human capital investment had three times the positive effect on economic growth as did physical investment.** And educational investment is particularly important in early childhood development and learning, according to growth economists. The return on investment from interventions such as prenatal care and early childhood programs is higher than for virtually any class of financial assets over time, according to Nobel Prize winning economist James Heckman. The academic literature also shows that failing to provide broad opportunities for nurturing, learning, and productive development harms economic growth and national competitiveness.

Plan solves tech industry competitiveness. There’s 3 links.

A. Pell Grants are key to community college programs which teach key tech skills. **Young 11**[[7]](#footnote-7)

Partnerships between corrections and community colleges with their links to business and industry were once common. **Until the mid-1990’s community colleges provided** large numbers of **prisoners** with **post-secondary education** and vocational training. Their programming was shown to reduce recidivism and increased returning inmates’ employment and earning power. 21 **But Pell grants** and other federal sources **that supported community college programs** categorically **dried up** as the result of changes in the law in the late 1990’s. 22 During the academic year 2009-2010 only 6% of all state prisoners enrolled in vocational or academic postsecondary programs and of these 86% were concentrated in just 13 states. 23 States such as Illinois that still provide community college instruction for prisoners do so with support from one or another combination of line items in the state corrections budget, student head-count funds provided to participating community colleges, or state financial aid, 24 funding that is no more likely to increase in the near future than is funding for other correctional programs. **The federal gov**ernment **could still** provide needed **support** for **a strong community college role in reentry.** In recent years **the Department of Labor awarded community colleges substantial grants for training in tech**nological **fields** such as nuclear and renewable energy, “green” retrofitting and cyber security. 25 The Program for **Prison** Reentry **Strategies would urge** that the Department of Labor invite applicant **community colleges to collaborate with corrections agencies** on one hand and businesses on the other and **to integrate returning prisoners into grantfunded academic** and vocational **programming.** Ordinarily, gaining the attention of the leadership of a major federal agency such as the Department of Labor for an issue like prisoner reentry might be difficult. Fortunately, the Administration recently created the Federal Interagency Reentry Council and charged it with exactly this task. 26

B. Pell Grants are key to SMART grants which encourage science education.

**Kolovic 13**[[8]](#footnote-8)

**Students** who have been determined **eligible for the** Federal **Pell Grant may** also **be eligible for the** National Science and Mathematics Access to Retain Talent (**SMART**) **Grant**. If you’re interested in the physical, life, or computer sciences, mathematics, technology, engineering, a critical foreign language, or non-major single liberal arts programs, don’t rule out this generous grant. What is a SMART Grant? **The SMART Grant** came onto the scene in 2005 to **reward[s] students** who, yes, are smart, but are also **interested** in fields predominantly **in math and science** and other high-demand areas. As a federal grant, you’ll need to fill out a Free Application for Federal Student Aid, or FAFSA, to determine whether you’re eligible for the SMART Grant and how much funding you could be eligible to receive. (You should always fill that application out anyway as it’s your ticket to free money from all government programs.) Your college should notify you if you’re eligible for the grant. Who may be eligible for SMART Grants? Only those in their third or fourth year of an undergraduate degree program – or fifth year of a five-year program – are eligible for the grant. **Eligible recipients must already be Pell recipients**, and show that they have high enough need to qualify for grant funding beyond their Pell award. Students must also have a minimum GPA of 3.0, and have at least one class in an eligible field of study the year the grant would be awarded.

C. Targeting prisoners is key to competitiveness. They’re a huge population, and they have 0 skilled work opportunities absent Pell Grants. **Chazelle 11**[[9]](#footnote-9)

The practical benefits of educating prisoners are well documented. **Over ninety percent of inmates eventually return to society; those who receive education**al programming **behind bars are more likely to find jobs** and do without government assistance. They have greater capacity to support relatives financially, contribute in positive ways to their communities, and help their kids succeed in school and stay out of trouble. The benefits extend to the wider public, as well, as study after study shows that educating inmates reduces recidivism – the rate at which they commit new crimes leading to re-arrest or re-incarceration. Although statistics vary, it appears that recidivism among offenders who complete some college work in prison drops by ten percent or more, even if they do not finish a degree. **Postsecondary** correctional **education is**, moreover, a **cost-effective** tool for improving public safety, **since it is** invariably **less expensive than prison** (an average of $25,251 per federal inmate in 2009). By lowering recidivism it saves taxpayers’ money, **and given our massive incarcerated population – over 2.3 million – it helps address the growing education gap between the US and other countries.** That prisons should offer postsecondary education would therefore seem common sense, yet this trait is in short supply among our politicians. The problem lies on both sides of the political spectrum: when it comes to educating inmates or, indeed, to implementing any reform that might mitigate the harshness of our penal system, Democrats, fearful of the soft-on-crime label, are as bad as – if not worse than – Republicans. The Clinton era illustrates this well. Our jail and prison population soared under Clinton, who signed into law the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994, a bill sponsored by Democrat Representative Jack Brooks and written by then-Senator Joe Biden. Among the measures of this legislation, sometimes called the “Biden Law,” was a $9.7 billion plan to build new prisons and a sharp increase in the number of crimes subject to the death penalty. Although the bill provided $6.1 billion for prevention initiatives, it contained a bipartisan amendment egregiously counter-prevention: inmates were henceforth barred from Pell grants, the major federal source of college financial assistance for low-income students. The average grant was small, only about $1500 per student in 1994, yet the cumulative impact was huge. With passage of the 1965 Higher Education Act, on which Pell grants were based, the number of postsecondary correctional education programs shot up from twelve that year to 350 during the Reagan presidency. **Ending Pell grants to inmates saved** enough to increase grants to **non-prison students** by **a paltry $5 each** per semester, **while decimating prison postsecondary education programs. After 1994, only eight remained open.**

Tech leadership is key to science diplomacy which solves every existential risk. **Fedoroff 8** writes[[10]](#footnote-10)

Chairman Baird, Ranking Member Ehlers, and distinguished members of the Subcommittee, thank you for this opportunity to discuss science diplomacy at the U.S. Department of State. The U.S. is recognized globally for its leadership in science and technology. Our **scientific strength is** both **a tool of “soft power”** – part of our strategic diplomatic arsenal – and a basis for creating partnerships with countries as they move beyond basic economic and social development. Science diplomacy is a central element of the Secretary’s transformational diplomacy initiative, because science and technology are essential to achieving stability and strengthening failed and fragile states. S&T advances have immediate and enormous influence on national and global economies, and thus on the international relations between societies. Nation states, nongovernmental organizations, and multinational corporations are largely shaped by their expertise in and access to intellectual and physical capital in science, technology, and engineering. Even as S&T advances of our modern era provide opportunities for economic prosperity, some also challenge the relative position of countries in the world order, and influence our social institutions and principles. **America must remain at the forefront** of this new world **by maintaining its tech**nological **edge**, and leading the way internationally through science diplomacy and engagement. The Public Diplomacy Role of Science Science by its nature facilitates diplomacy because it strengthens political relationships, embodies powerful ideals, and creates opportunities for all. **The global scientific community embraces** principles Americans cherish: **transparency,** meritocracy, accountability, the **objective** evaluation of **evidence, and broad** and frequently **democratic participation.** Science is inherently democratic, respecting evidence and truth above all. **Science is also a common global language, able to bridge deep political and religious divides.** Scientists share a common language. Scientific interactions serve to keep open lines of communication and cultural understanding. As scientists everywhere have a common evidentiary external reference system, members of ideologically divergent societies can use the common language of science to cooperatively address both domestic and the increasingly trans-national and global problems confronting humanity in the 21st century. There is a growing recognition that science and technology will increasingly drive the successful economies of the 21st century. Science and technology provide an immeasurable benefit to the U.S. by bringing scientists and students here, especially from developing countries, where they see democracy in action, make friends in the international scientific community, become familiar with American technology, and contribute to the U.S. and global economy. For example, in 2005, over 50% of physical science and engineering graduate students and postdoctoral researchers trained in the U.S. have been foreign nationals. Moreover, many foreign-born scientists who were educated and have worked in the U.S. eventually progress in their careers to hold influential positions in ministries and institutions both in this country and in their home countries. They also contribute to U.S. scientific and technologic development: According to the National Science Board’s 2008 Science and Engineering Indicators, 47% of full-time doctoral science and engineering faculty in U.S. research institutions were foreign-born. Finally, some **types of science** – particularly those **that address** the **grand challenges** in science and technology – **are inherently** international in scope and **collaborative** by necessity. The ITER Project, an international fusion research and development collaboration, is a product of the thaw in superpower relations between Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev and U.S. President Ronald Reagan. This reactor will harness the power of nuclear fusion as a possible new and viable energy source by bringing a star to earth. ITER serves as a symbol of international scientific cooperation among key scientific leaders in the developed and developing world – Japan, Korea, China, E.U., India, Russia, and United States – representing 70% of the world’s current population. The recent elimination of funding for FY08 U.S. contributions to the ITER project comes at an inopportune time as the Agreement on the Establishment of the ITER International Fusion Energy Organization for the Joint Implementation of the ITER Project had entered into force only on October 2007. The **elimination of** the promised **U.S. contribution drew** our **allies to question our** commitment and **credibility** in international cooperative ventures. More problematically, **it jeopardizes** a platform for reaffirming U.S. **relations with key states.** It should be noted that even at the height of the cold war, the United States used science diplomacy as a means to maintain communications and avoid misunderstanding between the world’s two nuclear powers – the Soviet Union and the United States. In a complex multi-polar world, relations are more challenging, the threats perhaps greater, and the need for engagement more paramount. Using Science Diplomacy to Achieve National Security Objectives The welfare and stability of countries and regions in many parts of the globe require a concerted effort by the developed world to address the causal factors that render countries fragile and cause states to fail. Countries that are unable to defend their people against starvation, or fail to provide economic opportunity, are susceptible to extremist ideologies, autocratic rule, and abuses of human rights. As well, **the world faces** common threats, among them climate change, **energy and water shortage**s, public **health emergencies, environmental degradation,** poverty, **food insecurity, and** religious **extremism**. These threats can undermine the national security of the United States, both directly and indirectly. Many are blind to political boundaries, becoming regional or global threats. The United States has no monopoly on knowledge in a globalizing world and the **scientific challenges facing humankind are enormous.** Addressing these common challenges demands common solutions and necessitates scientific cooperation, common standards, and common goals. We must increasingly harness the power of American ingenuity in science and technology through strong partnerships with the science community in both academia and the private sector, in the U.S. and abroad among our allies, to advance U.S. interests in foreign policy. There are also important challenges to the ability of states to supply their populations with sufficient food. The still-growing human population, rising affluence in emerging economies, and other factors have combined to create unprecedented pressures on global prices of staples such as edible oils and grains. Encouraging and promoting the use of contemporary molecular techniques in crop improvement is an essential goal for US **science diplomacy**. An essential part of the war on terrorism is a war of ideas. The creation of economic opportunity **can** do much more to **combat** the rise of **fanaticism** than can any weapon. The war of ideas is a war about rationalism as opposed to irrationalism. Science and technology put us firmly on the side of rationalism by providing ideas and opportunities that improve people’s lives. We may use the recognition and the goodwill that science still generates for the United States to achieve our diplomatic and developmental goals. Additionally, the Department continues to use science as a means to reduce the proliferation of the weapons’ of mass destruction and prevent what has been dubbed ‘brain drain’. Through cooperative threat reduction activities, former weapons scientists redirect their skills to participate in peaceful, collaborative international research in a large variety of scientific fields. In addition, **new global efforts focus on** improving **biological, chemical, and nuclear security** by promoting and implementing best scientific practices as a means to enhance security, increase global partnerships, and create sustainability.

Infinite values don’t paralyze calculation. **Lauwers and Vallentyne 04** write[[11]](#footnote-11)

**Zero Independence holds that the ranking of two worlds is determined by** the pattern of **differences in local value. This**, we claim, **is highly plausible** in the context of finitely additive value theories. In the finite case, finitely additive value theories always satisfy Zero Independence. Although they typically get expressed as judging a world as at least as good as another (having the same locations) if and only if its total value is at least as great, the **reference to the total is not needed.** An equivalent statement is that one world as at least as good as the second if and only if the sum of the differences in value is at least as great as zero. **Only the pattern of differences matters**. **Even in the infinite case**, Zero Independence is “partially” implied by Sum and Loose Pareto. Sum ranks U as at least as good as V if and only if Sum ranks U-V as at least as good as its zero world. Moreover, if two worlds U and V satisfy the antecedent clause of Loose Pareto, then Loose Pareto ranks U as at least as good as V if and only if it ranks U-V above its zero world. Zero Independence is thus, we claim, highly plausible for finitely additive theories.

Zero Independence is equivalent to a condition in social choice theory known as Translation Scale Invariance when it is restricted to the case where locations are the same.[[12]](#footnote-12) This latter condition holds that interlocational comparisons of zero points are irrelevant to the ranking of worlds. The zero point for value at each location, that is, can be set independently of how it is set for other locations (although, of course, when comparing two worlds, the zero point used for a given location in one world must also be used for that location in the second world). For example, if a location has values of 10 in world U and 5 in world V, both measured on the basis of some particular zero point (the same for both worlds), those values could be changed to 7 and 2 (by making the zero point 3 units higher for that location), and this, according to Translation Scale Invariance, would not alter how the two worlds are ranked.

Zero Independence is equivalent to Translation Scale Invariance (restricted to the case where locations are the same), since any change in the zero points for the locations in worlds U and V can, for some W, be represented by U+W and V+W. (For example, if there are just two people, and the first person’s zero point is decreased by two units, and the second person’s zero point is increased by one unit, then the resulting two representations of the value of U and V are simply U+W and V+W, where W is <2,-1>.) Zero Independence and Translation Scale Invariance thus each hold that U ≥ V if and only if U+W ≥ V+W.

Translation Scale Invariance (and hence, Zero Independence) is highly plausible for finitely additive value theories. (Recall that our goal is to defend a particular extension of finite additivity, not to defend finite additivity against non-additive theories.) **If there is no natural zero point that separates positive from negative value** (if there is just more or less value with no natural separating point), **then any particular zero point is arbitrary** (not representing a real aspect of value). In this case, interlocational comparisons of zero-points are uncontroversially irrelevant. **If**, on the other hand, **there is a natural zero for value, it is still** plausible for finitely additive value theories to hold that it is **irrelevant** for ranking worlds. **What matters** (e.g., **from** a **util**itarian perspective), as argued above, **are** the **differences in value at each location between two worlds—not the absolute level of values** at locations. No interlocational comparison of zero points is needed for this purpose.

Cost-benefit analysis is feasible. Ignore any util calc indicts. **Hardin 90** writes[[13]](#footnote-13)

**One** of the **cute**r **charge**s **against util**itarianism **is that** it is irrational in the following sense. **If I take the time to calculate** the consequences of various courses of action before me, **then** I will ipso facto have chosen the course of action to take, namely, to sit and calculate, because while I am calculating the other **courses of action will cease to be open to me. It should embarrass philosophers that they have ever taken this** objection **seriously. Parallel considerations in other realms are dismissed** with eminently good sense. Lord Devlin notes, “If the reasonable man ‘worked to rule’ by perusing to the point of comprehension every form he was handed, the commercial and administrative life of the country would creep **to** a standstill.” James March and Herbert Simon **escape** the quandary of **unending calculation** by noting that often we satisfice, **we do not maximize: we stop calculating** and considering **when we find a merely adequate choice** of action. **When**, in principle, **one cannot know what is** the **best** choice, **one can nevertheless be sure that** sitting and **calculating is not the best choice.** But, one may ask, How do you know that another ten minutes of calculation would not have produced a better choice? And one can only answer, You do not. At some point the quarrel begins to sound adolescent. It is ironic that **the point** of the quarrel **is almost never at issue in practice** (as Devlin implies, **we are** almost all **too reasonable** in practice **to bring the world to a standstill**) but only in the principled discussions of academics.

The standard is maximizing happiness. 6 reasons.

First is Doxastic Determinism.

Belief formation is not voluntary. We have no freedom over our long-term beliefs. **Alston 89**[[14]](#footnote-14)

Let's turn now to a critical examination of the basic control thesis, the thesis that one can take up at will whatever prepositional attitude one chooses. Those who have attacked this view are divided between those who hold that believing at will is logically impossible and those who hold that it is only psychologically impossible, a capacity that we in fact lack though one we conceivably could have had.16 I cannot see any sufficient reasons for the stronger claim, and so I shall merely contend that we are not so constituted as to be able to take up propositional attitudes at will. My argument for this, if it can be called that, simply consists in asking you to consider whether you have any such powers. **Can you**, at this moment, start to **believe that the U**nited **S**tates **is still a colony of Great Britain, just by deciding to** do so**? If you find it too incredible** that you should be sufficiently motivated **to** try to **believe this, suppose that someone offers you $500,000,000 to believe it**, and you are much more interested in the money than in believing the truth. Could you do what it takes to get that reward? Remember that we are speaking about believing at will. No doubt, there are things you could do that would increase the probability of your coming to believe this, but that will be discussed later. Can you switch propositional attitudes toward that proposition just by deciding to do so? **It seems clear** to me **that I have no such power.** Volitions, decisions, or choosings don't hook up with anything in the way of propositional attitude inauguration, just as they don't hook up with the secretion of gastric juices or cell metabolism. There could conceivably be individual differences in this regard. Some people can move their ears at will, while most of us cannot. However, I very much doubt that any human beings are endowed with the power of taking on propositional attitudes at will. The temptation to suppose otherwise may stem from conflating that power with others that we undoubtedly do have but that are clearly distinct. If I were to set out to bring myself into a state of belief that p, just by an act of will, I might assert that p with an expression of conviction, or dwell favorably on the idea that p, or imagine a sentence expressing p emblazoned in the heavens with an angelic chorus in the background intoning the Kyrie of Mozart's Coronation Mass. All this I can do at will, but none of this amounts to taking on a belief that p. It is all show, an elaborate pretence of believing. Having gone through all this, my doxastic attitudes will remain just as they were before; or if there is some change, it will be a result of these gyrations. We should not suppose that our inability to believe at will is restricted to propositions that are obviously false. The inability also extends, at least, to those that are obviously true. A few pages back we made the point that voluntary control attaches to contrary pairs, or to more complex arrays of alternatives. If the sphere of my effective voluntary control does not extend both to A and to not-A, then it attaches to neither. If I don't have the power to choose between A and not-A, then we are without sufficient reason to say that I did A at will, rather than just doing A, accompanied by a volition. It is even more obvious, if possible, that responsibility, obligation, and their kindred attach to doing A only if the agent has an effective choice between doing and not doing A. If I would still have done A whatever I willed, chose, or preferred, I can hardly be blamed for doing it. Thus, even if I willingly, or not unwillingly, form, for instance, perceptual beliefs in the way I do, it by no means follows that I form those beliefs at will, or that I have voluntary control over such belief formation, or that I can be held responsible or blameworthy for doing so. **It would have to be true that I have** effective voluntary **control over whether I** do or do not **believe that the tree has leaves** on it **when I see a tree with leaves on it** just before me **in broad daylight** with my eyesight working perfectly. And it is perfectly clear that in this situation I have no power at all to refrain from that belief. And so with everything else that seems perfectly obvious to us. **We have just as little voluntary control over ordinary belief formed by introspection**, memory, and simple uncontroversial inferences.

Doxastic unfreedom undermines deontology and justifies util. **Petersen 11**[[15]](#footnote-15)

These problems should sound like special cases of more general problems in the intersection of action theory and normative ethics. **Is responsible choice in intention** what is **essential** to positive evaluation**? Is there** such a thing as a **choice for which we can be** (truly) **responsible in the ﬁrst place? The Kantian** deontologist **must answer both** of these **positively, but** the **util**itarian **need not.** This is especially good for the epistemic utilitarian, since the conceptual coherence of free will faces tougher challenges than usual at the doxastic level.14 Traditional libertarian views will ascribe some separate form of causation to agents from the natural causation to which we are accustomed, and as applied in epistemology this mysterious causation would foreclose on any scientiﬁc account of how we form beliefs. It is far too early in the science side of the game for such foreclosures, and indeed given how far the science already has come, such foreclosures would look entirely arbitrary.15 It is possible a compatibilist version of doxastic voluntarism would be sufficient for Kantian epistemic responsibility, but compatibilism, too, has worse than usual problems at the cognitive level. If we explain epistemic agency in terms of causal processes, our inclination to epistemic blame is even more likely to balk than in the ordinary action cases. A compatibilist approach to epistemic agency will require a close look at the **causal mechanisms** at the sub-propositional level that underwrite the formation **of belief**. These **are not** likely to be **susceptible to**, say, **a Frankfurt**-**type** account **of freedom, since it will make little sense** in most cases **to speak of** the agents’ **desires (of any order) with respect to** such ﬁne details of **cognition.**16 Again, at the level of normative ethics the utilitarian has a typical strategy for handling these problems—one that can be carried straightforwardly into the epistemic realm. **Since util**itarian value **does not depend on** the formation of **free intentions,** the **util**itarian **can** consistently **deny** the existence of any robust free will, including **doxastic freedom.** The utilitarian also must deny the existence of what we might call “thick” moral responsibility—the moral responsibility of the retributivist, who claims that it can be just to punish even when net consequences of such punishment are bad.17 To the utilitarian, punishment and reward are only justiﬁed, as anything, by its impact on welfare. The utilitarian thus has what we might call a “thin” notion of moral responsibility. Roughly speaking, **for** a **util**itarian **to say someone is responsible** for an outcome **is** just **to say that** the person houses the most appropriate place to apply change in order to bring about more future utility with respect to that outcome. When Squeaky is responsible for murder, this means that efforts to redress current and future such harms are best concentrated on her. Squeaky is not morally responsible in the thick sense for the act; she does not deserve punishment for its own sake. Nonetheless **it can be just to subject her to** isolation and **rehab**ilitation for the sake of future consequences. To the extent we discover that Charlie caused Squeaky to murder, that is the extent to which we discover Charlie is the more effective place to apply such change, and thus in the utilitarian sense we attribute him more of the moral responsibility for the crime.18

Second, reductionism.

Brain studies prove that there’s no such thing as personal identity. **Parfit 84** writes[[16]](#footnote-16)

Some **recent medical cases provide striking evidence in favour of the Reductionist View.** Human beings have a **lower brain and** two **upper hemispheres**, which **are connected by a bundle of fibres.** In treating a few people with severe epilepsy, **surgeons have cut these fibres.** The aim was to reduce the severity of epileptic fits, by confining their causes to a single hemisphere. This aim was achieved. But the operations had another unintended consequence. **The effect**, in the words of one surgeon, **was the creation of ‘two separate spheres of consciousness.’ This effect was revealed by** various **psychological tests.** These made use of two facts. We control our right arms with our left hemispheres, and vice versa. And what is in the right halves of our visual fields we see with our left hemispheres, and vice versa. When someone’s hemispheres have been disconnected, **psychologists can thus present** to this person two different written **questions in the two halves of his visual field, and can receive two different answers** written by this person’s two hands.

In the absence of personal identity, only end states can matter. **Shoemaker 99**[[17]](#footnote-17)

Extreme reductionism might lend support to utilitarianism in the following way. Many people claim that we are justified in maximizing the good in our own lives, but not justified in maximizing the good across sets of lives, simply because each of us is a single, deeply unified person, unified by the further fact of identity, whereas there is no such corresponding unity across sets of lives. But if the only justification for the different treatment of individual lives and sets of lives is the further fact, and this fact is undermined by the truth of reductionism, then nothing justifies this different treatment. **There are no deeply unified subjects of experience. What remains are merely the experiences themselves, and so any ethical theory distinguishing between individual lives** and sets of lives **is mistaken.** If the deep, further fact is missing, then there are no unities. **The morally significant units should then be the states people are in at particular times, and an ethical theory that focused on them** and attempted to improve their quality, whatever their location, **would be the most plausible. Util**itarianism **is just such a theory.**

Moral uncertainty means that extinction comes first under any moral system.

**Bostrom 2** writes[[18]](#footnote-18)

These reflections on **moral uncertainty suggest[s]** an alternative, complementary way of looking at existential risk. Let me elaborate. Our present understanding of axiology might well be confused. **[that] We may not** now **know**—at least not in concrete detail—**what outcomes would count as a big win for humanity;** we might not even yet be able to imagine the best ends of our journey. If we are indeed profoundly **uncertain about our ultimate aims,** then **we should recognize that there is** a **great option value in preserving**—and ideally improving—**our ability to recognize value and to steer the future accordingly. Ensuring that there will be a future version of humanity with great powers and a propensity to use them wisely is** plausibly **the best way** available to us **to increase the probability that the future will contain a lot of value.**

Ignore permissibility and presumption because moral uncertainty means we’ll always have a non-zero credence in the existence of morality, so there’s always a risk of offense in favor of one action.

The neg must defend one unconditional advocacy. Conditionality is bad because it makes the neg a moving target which kills 1AR strategy. He’ll kick it if I cover it and extend it if I undercover it, meaning I have no strategic options. Also, it’s unreciprocal because I can’t kick the AC.

I define rehab as federal support for reentry programs. Prefer this interpretation.

First, it sets the best limits. Here’s a caselist. **Nielson 11** writes[[19]](#footnote-19)

Rehabilitation has been considered a primary goal of the prison system throughout the twentieth century, even though it has not been in vogue for many decades (Harvard Law Review, 2010). The debate about rehabilitation has a long, complex history in the US. Bottom line: "Effective programming requires money, effort, and a recommitment to rehabilitation. But it is not only an investment in safe prisons and jails. It is also an investment in safe and healthy communities" (Gibbons & Katzenbach, 2006). Rehabilitation is a critical to overcome the collateral consequences of being a convict which limit the convicted individuals social, economic, and political opportunities after release (Pinard, 2006). If society wants ex-prisoners to succeed, to be rehabilitated, then it has to provide them tools while they are still incarcerated to prepare for the moment of release to reenter society and reenter their families and communities. Reentry begins inside the prison with programs that provide inmates with the stability necessary to transition back into their communities (Muhlhausen, 2010). **Offender reentry programs would be an excellent way to narrow a debate about rehab**ilitation, but before I get to the sorts of affirmative and negative I think are viable under a prison rehabilitation topic, I would like to discuss the benefits of prison reform as a controversy area to the debate community.

**[…]**

The following discussion is focused around mainstream reentry and **rehab**ilitation **programs** which **could be** increased (**created** or expanded) **by Congress.**

**One clear option** for prison reform **is** the improvement of and increase of **education** and training programs. "Prisoners--who are less likely to have completed high school or obtained a General Equivalency Diploma (GED) than the general population--typically enter prison with an educational disadvantage. In fact, there is a direct correlation between a lack of education and the probability of incarceration" (Colgan, 2006). Leaving prison with that same education deficiency has been linked to recidivism; in contrast, educational programs are linked with lowering recidivism (Colgan, 2006). Basic education, vocational programs, & post-secondary education are all possible affirmatives on a prison reform topic (Nixon et al, 2008). Affirmatives may mandate vocational programs offering particular career training to fill holes in the economy (Colgan, 2006). Affirmatives could reform the fees system used by education programs which would encourage enrollment in education programs. **Aff**irmatives **could provide incentives for community college**s to offer **programs for prisoners** to help **with** applications, necessary testing, and **financial aid.**

**Another** affirmative option **is work release**. The unemployment rate for ex-offenders is 33% (Burt, 2010). "There are a number of studies that demonstrate that employment is a fundamental component of the reentry process, and that ex-offenders who are able to find stable employment are much more likely to succeed in their rehabilitation than those who cannot find work" (Nuñez-Neto, 2008). Without income offenders are likely to commit another crime as a means of support (Burt, 2010). "Employment is one of the strongest predictors that an ex-offender will be successful after release and not backslide into crime" (Nuñez-Neto, 2008). If ex-offenders face continual rejection in the labor market, then they are more likely to give up looking for a job and turn to criminal activity to provide an income. Work release allows prisoners to engage in full-time or part-time employment in order to facilitate their re-entry into the labor market after release. Legislation could introduce partnerships between the states Department of Corrections and businesses to provide incentives for businesses to hire prisoners from work release programs post-release (Colgan, 2006). The federal government could also create temporary job programs for ex-prisoners (Burt, 2010).

**Drug** and alcohol **treatment programs** are a practical necessity that many affirmatives could advocate. "Nationally, at least 30 percent of convicted persons report they used illegal drugs at the time of their offense" (Colgan, 2006). Roughly 80% of prisoners report drug use in their history, even if not at the time of the crime (Colgan, 2006). Providing chemical dependency treatment programs would help a large segment of the prison population. The general population believes that putting an addict in prison eliminates their ability to access the substances of their addiction which cures the addiction, but after release without a treatment program many recovering addicts return to substance abuse (Kendrick, 2011). There is solid empirical evidence that ordering inmates into treatment programs and getting them to participate in treatment reduces recidivism (Kendrick, 2011).

**Health** services are a fundamental need in prisons. Health care costs are a huge issue for prison systems and when the state is completely responsible for footing the bill the quality of inmate care may suffer (Quinn, 2009). Inmate health care "is frequently so inadequate that "preventable suffering and death behind bars" has been "normalized" (Dolovich, 2009). There are facilities with four or five thousand prisoners and only three or four doctors and some physicians are limited to work in correctional facilities because they are not qualified to care for the general population (Gibbon & Katzenbach, 2006). Courts have held that inmates have the right to health care, but the quality of the care is still up for debate (Quinn, 2009). 30 states have some form of co-payments for health care required of inmates which discourages prisoners from seeking treatment (Quinn, 2009; Gibbon & Katzenbach, 2006). The Commission on Safety and Abuse in America's Prisons recommends co-pay laws be revoked and Medicaid and Medicare be extended to eligible prisoners (Gibbon & Katzenbach, 2006). Mental health services are desperately needed in prisons. The prevalence of mental illness in prisons is 2 to 4 times higher than that of the general public (Colgan, 2006). Many prisoners do not receive any treatment for mental illness. There is a lack of staffing, medication, and supervision for prisoners with mental illnesses. "The consequences of failing to provide mental health care include suffering, self-mutilation, rage and violence, unnecessary placement in segregation, victimization, and suicide" (Colgan, 2006). The lack of mental health care also poses a risk to inmates who are not ill because inmates with mental illness are more likely to cause disciplinary problems than other inmates. Another significant problem is the inability to reenter society; untreated mental illness makes it more difficult for inmates to become productive, law-abiding citizens (Kendrick, 2011). The most common treatment is segregation which mental health professional argue often worsens the illness (Colgan, 2006). Children **& family services** are an important part of successful rehabilitation. 1.5 million children have parents in the DOC (Colgan, 2006). There is significant evidence about the impact of prisons on family and social networks. Children are taken from parents when they are incarcerated and often there is no visitation once the children are removed. Family structures face intense strain when prisoners reenter the family (Lyles-Chockley, 2009). Parents strain to reconnect with their children and children can go through serious trauma as parents reenter their lives; neither have had a chance to build a relationship during incarceration (Lyles-Chockley, 2009). The racial disparities in incarceration rates have a devastating impact on communities practically dissolving important social networks, particularly in black families (Lyles-Chockley, 2009). There will be affirmatives providing services for prisoners to interact with their children (Colgan, 2006).

**The largest aff** on the topic **would be comprehensive transition**al service programs, which are all in one programs including education, job training and placement, life skills, family reunification services, assistance, chemical dependency treatment, and mental health services (Colgan, 2006). Several states (Tennessee, Hawaii, & New York) have comprehensive programs that could be modeled on a federal level (Colgan, 2006). Holistic reentry services provide for prisoners needs across the board instead of in small pieces. Comprehensive reentry programs recognize the linkages between jobs, education, and social services. "By starting a prisoner with a Plan which identifies all of his or her needs and addresses them holistically, the likelihood of success while in prison and upon release are improved" (Colgan, 2006). In general, access to social services which some are explicitly denied would help convicts overcome significant obstacles to reentry.

Second, debating reentry policies is key to criminal justice education. **Swanson et al 10** writes[[20]](#footnote-20)

**Reentry is an important topic among policy-makers** in national government. It is generally defined as the use of programs, practices, and strategies targeted at promoting the successful reentry of prisoners back into the community Faced with significant numbers of newly released prisoners, including those convicted of serious crimes, the Bush administration created a Prison Reentry Initiative (Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice, n.d.). Designed as a cooperative effort among several federal agencies, it funds state reentry programs. In addition, Bureau of Justice Assistance grants are awarded to state departments of corrections for developing prerelease services for prisoners transitioning back home. In April, 2008 President Bush also signed the Second Chance Act that creates an interagency council on reentry, provides additional funding for state programs, and authorizes direct grants to non-profit organizations for mentoring and other services for returning adult and juvenile offenders. The 2009 federal budget allocated $25,000,000 for reentry (Browning 2009). The Obama administration has budgeted $100,000,000 for these programs for 2010, a four-fold increase if appropriated (Browning 2009). **Reentry is of consequence for criminal justice education because every facet of the c**riminal **j**ustice **s**ystem, policing, courts, and corrections has contributed to the creation of this problem and **will be affected** by the large numbers of inmates returning from prison. Police will be faced with large numbers of prior offenders who are known to reoffend. The courts will have to deal with the increased work load produced by returning offenders, and ultimately the correctional system will face having to house large numbers of offenders who return to their already overcrowded facilities. Criminal justice education can play a significant role in helping society to come to grips with the legal, political, and public policy issues raised by reentry. **We are** currently **educating the next generation of criminal justice scholars** and practitioners **who will be called upon to provide** the data and **policy initiatives to deal with** the issues raised by **reentry.**

It is our belief that **reentry offers numerous opportunities for research and teaching. There will also be increased opportunities for** bachelor's educated practitioners to **work with the reentry population.** However, working with this population calls for specialized skills tailored to meet the needs of these offenders. Skills related to case management and increased **understanding of substance abuse,** mental illness, housing, **job training,** vocational training, **and education**al opportunities **will be required for** our **students** to take advantage of these opportunities. In addition, there is a need for theoretical understanding of the reentry process as well as knowledge of research methodologies that are helpful for understanding the problem. Legal issues and discretionary decision-making are also relevant to the success of reentry efforts. Will the curriculum in criminal justice education at all levels, but particularly at the undergraduate level, sufficiently prepare students for these new challenges brought about by reentry?

Empirics confirm. Reentry is the most important and least discussed form of criminal justice education. **Swanson et al 10** writes[[21]](#footnote-21)

In this research, **the authors utilize a survey** of members of a national criminal justice organization (Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences) in an effort **to gauge the coverage of reentry** issues **in criminal justice education.** The selection of reentry issues is based on the review of reentry literature. The survey is designed to assess the relative amount of time respondents devote to each topic in fractions of a 16-week semester. The survey was administered electronically through an email link to the instrument. The survey was sent to a total of 1,631 individuals. Thirty-seven were returned as undeliverable or as automated out- of-office replies and another 35 potential participants were bounced out of the survey by the program. A total of 408 respondents completed the survey out of the remaining 1,559 potential participants, resulting in a response rate of 26%. While this response rate is relatively low, web-based surveys commonly result in lower response rates than telephone or male surveys (Couper 2000; DiNitto et al. 2008; Tourangeau 2004). There are several explanations for the relatively low response rate. Recipients included criminal justice educators, practitioners, students, and others interested in criminal justice. The sampling frame does not provide for discerning which recipients teach classes in academic settings. Correspondence from numerous recipients indicates that many members of the national organization do not teach classes. Those individuals who indicated that they did not teach were asked not to complete the survey. In addition, the first two survey questions asked whether the respondent taught in a four- or two-year program, respectively. Only those respondents indicating that they taught in either a four- or two-year program were included in the analysis. Furthermore, the email message introducing the survey identifies its purpose as obtaining information about reentry issues. Return emails from recipients indicates that many of them did not participate because reentry is not their area of interest or expertise. While recipients who showed a reluctance to participate were encouraged to complete the survey, the authors believe that many recipients did not contribute because they felt their responses were not relevant to the research. Thus, it is likely that the results actually overestimate the treatment of reentry issues in criminal justice education due to the self- filtering of many recipients who do not cover such issues in their courses. Those who teach research methods, policing, and courts are possible examples Results Of the 408 respondents, 92.1% indicated that they taught in either a four- or two-year program (see Table 1). Since the focus of this analysis is on criminal justice education, only those respondents indicating that they taught were included in the analysis, resulting in 372 total cases for analysis. Due to the relatively small sample size, pairwise deletion was utilized to maximize the sample size for each analysis. The percentage of cases missing data ranged from 3.2% to 15.6% for the variables used in the analysis. While the missing data produce the potential for biased results, the authors feel that the data provide a solid baseline for this exploratory analysis. The overwhelming majority of respondents, 88.7%, teach in four-year programs. The mean number of majors in their programs is 429 students, with an average of nine faculty members in their departments and average class sizes of 34 students. There is a relatively even split between academic ranks for the respondents: 27.2% hold the rank of professor; 26.2% hold the rank of associate professor; and 32.5% hold the rank of assistant professor. The remaining 15% of respondents are either instructors or adjunct faculty. Nearly three-quarters of the respondents have a PhD, while just over 17% earned their highest degree at the master's level. For the majority of respondents, 55%, their highest degree is in criminal justice, criminology, or justice studies. Seventeen percent hold a degree in sociology, while 14.5% of respondents indicate "other" for their degree field. Open-ended responses indicate that the "other" category primarily includes education, public administration, and psychology. In addition, one-third of respondents designate employment experience in the corrections field. The majority of respondents teach courses in introductory criminal justice and corrections, **while a substantial percentage teach criminology,** policing, **theory, and research** methods courses. **Only 2%** of respondents report **teach**ing **a course on** prisoner **reentry**, while 4% teach a drug-related course. Thus, it appears that when reentry issues are addressed, they are largely covered in more general courses.

**Over 60%** of the respondents **reported that** offender **reentry is** a **very important** topic **in criminal justice education, while another 28% view the topic as important.** Table 2 provides the survey findings for the treatment of numerous reentry issues in criminal justice education. A majority of respondents address 13 of the 14 reentry issues listed. The most commonly covered topics are those involving drug and substance abuse, mental health, and the impact of prisoner reentry on communities with over three-quarters of respondents reporting that they provided some attention to these issues. The least addressed reentry topics are parenting, case management, literacy, and anger issues. Table 3 provides a breakdown of the amount of coverage of each reentry issue for only those respondents who reported they addressed the topics.2 While the previous table shows that a majority of respondents covered reentry issues, the findings in Table 3 indicate that the treatment of those issues with respect to time-frame is very limited. For each issue, **over two-thirds** of the respondents **report** that they provide the **minimum** amount of **coverage**, one to two weeks. Community impact, mental health, and victim issues are most likely to receive additional attention, with over one-third of respondents reporting at least three to four weeks of coverage in their courses.

In an effort to better understand the context under which reentry issues are taught in criminal justice education, a reentry scale was created which measures the overall coverage of all reentry issues. The scale had a range of 1.0 to 5.0, with 1.0 representing no coverage and 5.0 indicating maximum coverage. Means tests were utilized to determine the effects of courses taught, academic rank, and degree field of respondents on reentry coverage. Table 4 reports the findings of the means tests broken down by courses taught. The findings show that those teaching courses on reentry, drug issues, corrections, and theory generally provide the most coverage of reentry issues. There is a significant difference in the amount of attention provided to reentry issues among those who teach these courses and those who do not teach them. This finding is not surprising given the nature of these courses, although our discussion on the relevance of reentry to a variety of topics might provide useful examples of how reentry issues can be more broadly integrated into criminal justice curricula. Tables 5 and 6 display the findings from means tests examining the effects of academic rank and degree field, respectively, on the reentry scale. In most cases, no statistically significant differences were uncovered. However, there is a significant difference in the treatment of reentry subjects by instructors. It appears that instructors cover reentry issues to a greater extent than instructors of other ranks. Perhaps this finding emerges because instructors are more likely to have work experience in the field and are more acutely aware of the importance of reentry issues.3 It is also possible that instructors are more likely to teach courses in which reentry issues are deemed more relevant to the focus of the course. Future research should examine the forces behind this finding. Discussion and Implications The results of the survey provide a positive picture with regard to reentry issues in criminal justice education, yet also indicate several areas for improvement.

Table 6 Comparison of mean level of coverage of reentry issues by degree field

Degree field

CJ/Criminology Other Significance

1.93 1.87 .454

Sociology Other

1.82 1.92 .335

Social work Other

1.81 1.90 .850

Political science Other

1.73 1.91 .245

Law Other

1.61 1.92 .061

The upside is that it appears that reentry issues are being addressed in criminal justice education. Students are exposed to many of the important reentry issues primarily in courses on corrections, drug abuse, and in those few courses offered specifically addressing prisoner reentry. But teachers also address reentry subjects broadly in other courses, often classified as core subjects. Nevertheless, given the implications of the vast numbers of offenders who will be returning to society as a result of decades of punitive crime policies, prisoner reentry arguably could assume greater prominence and more wide- spread coverage in criminal justice education. **While** the findings reported here indicate that **reentry issues are addressed, depth and breadth** of coverage **appear**s to be **lacking** as measured by the amount of time devoted to the subject and the variety of courses in which reentry is addressed. As indicated in Table 4, respondents teaching courses in policing, courts, research and statistics, and introductory criminal justice and criminology are less likely to cover reentry issues. As noted earlier, it can be argued that **the impact of reentry** issues **on all aspects of** the **criminal justice** system **points to a need to cover the topic** in courses in which reentry can be thought of as relevant. Our contention is that reentry is relevant to these courses. The central question, it seems, is this: Is criminal justice education adequately preparing students to address the needs of contemporary criminal justice in practice?

Criminal justice education outweighs other offense. **Nielson 11** writes[[22]](#footnote-22)

Second, **if a large percent**age **of debaters enter** into **law** school, **political science, or social justice** work post their undergraduate studies, **then the prison topic would be valuable** as practical **research for** their **future studies. Debate skills, such as research**, listening, public speaking, personal expression, problem-solving skills, **are highly transferable** in these areas of graduate study. We are all familiar with research indicating **70% of judges recommend** participation in **intercollegiate debate as a precursor to law school** (Freely & Steinberg, 2009). **Debaters** themselves **list law school prep**aration **as one** of the **advantage**s **of** intercollegiate **debate** (Williams, McGee & Worth, 2001). You aren't likely go to law school and skip over a discussion of the penal system. **The debate community has an opportunity to prepare** our undergraduates **for** work in **a field they are most likely to go into.**

Third, extinction. Debating specific nuclear scenarios is key to stave off actual nuclear war. **Harvard Nuclear Study Group 83** writes[[23]](#footnote-23)

The question is grisly, but nonetheless it must be asked. **Nuclear war cannot be avoided** simply **by refusing to think about it.** Indeed the task of **reducing** the likelihood of **nuclear war should begin with** an effort to **understand[ing] how it might start. When strategists in Washington** or Moscow **study** the possible origins of **nuclear war, they discuss “scenarios,”** imagined sequences of future events that could trigger the use of nuclear weaponry. Scenarios are, of course, speculative exercises. They often leave out the political developments that might lead to the use of force in order to focus on military dangers. That nuclear war scenarios are even more speculative than most is something for which we can be thankful, for it reflects humanity’s fortunate lack of experience with atomic warfare since 1945. But imaginary as they are, **nuclear scenarios can help identify problems not understood or dangers not yet** prevented because they have not been **foreseen.**

4. Textuality. “Resolved” means a policy. **Words and Phrases 64** writes[[24]](#footnote-24)

**Definition of** the word **“resolve,”** given by Webster is “to express an opinion or determination by resolution or vote; as ‘it was resolved by the legislature;” It **is** of **similar** force **to the word “enact,”** which is defined by Bouvier as **meaning “to establish by law”.**

“Ought” can only refer to action, even in the context of “ought to be.”

**Prichard 12** writes[[25]](#footnote-25)

But this argument, if it is to restore the sense of obligation to act, must presuppose an intermediate link, viz., the further thesis that what is good ought to be. The necessity of this link is obvious. An "ought," if it is to be derived at all, can only be derived from another "ought." Moreover this link tacitly presupposes another, viz., that the apprehension that something good which is not an action ought to be involves just the feeling of imperativeness or obligation which is to be aroused by the thought of the action which will originate it. Otherwise the argument will not lead us to feel the obligation to produce it by the action. And, surely, both this link and its implication are false.[1](http://www.ditext.com/prichard/mistake.html#1) **The word "ought" refers to actions and to actions alone.** The proper language is never "So and so ought to be," but "I ought to do so and so." **Even if we** are sometimes moved to say that the world or something in it is not what it **ought to be, what we really mean is** that God or **some human** being has not made something what he **ought to have made it**. And it is merely stating another side of this fact to urge that we can only feel the imperativeness upon us of something which is in our power; **for** it is actions and **actions alone** which, directly at least, **are in our power.**

5. Case is a disad to theory. Pell Grants discourse is key to real world reform.

**Abdul-Alim 12** writes[[26]](#footnote-26)

John J. Farmer, Jr., former New Jersey attorney general and now **Dean** and Professor **of Law at** the **Rutgers** School of Law, **called** the restoration of **Pell grants for prisoners “one of the most important dialogues we can have in** the context of **law enforcement.”** “I think that education in our prisons is the key to preventing recidivism,” Farmer said. Farmer made his remarks Thursday at the Rutgers University Paul Robeson Campus Center during an event titled “Pell Grants and Prison Education: How Pell Grant Access in Prison Transforms Lives.” Among those who spoke in support of lifting the ban on Pell grants to prisoners was Dallas Pell, daughter of the late U.S. Sen. Claiborne Pell, father of Pell grants. Pell, who is founder of an organization called Pell Grants for Public Safety, said providing education for individuals in prison is a “no-brainer” and “one of the most effective tools we have to make our community safe.” Pell and various speakers noted how a plethora of studies have repeatedly found that higher education for prisoners significantly reduces their likelihood of returning to prison. Indeed, a 2005 Institute for Higher Education report, titled “Learning to Reduce Recidivism,” noted how “research consistently demonstrates that participation in educational programs while incarcerated reduces recidivism rates by increasing an individual’s ability to successfully rejoin mainstream society upon release from prison.” The paper also recommends restoration of Pell grants for prisoners. While academic support for education in correctional settings is easy to find, political will to lift the federal ban on Pell grants to prisoners has been more difficult to garner. **Farmer** said toward the end of his stint as New Jersey Attorney General from 1999 to 2002, he **tried to sponsor legislation** that would provide for increased educational opportunities for prisoners in order to make it easier for them to reenter society. “At the time **there** just **was no traction** among the political people to pass legislation like this,” Farmer said. The group that organized Thursday’s discussion – **The E**ducation from the **I**nside **O**ut Coalition – has faced similar challenges. Over the past few years, the organization has **approached key members of Congress** and, more recently, officials at the U.S. Department of Education in an attempt to get them **to reverse the** 1994 **ban** on Pell grants for incarcerated individuals. Each time, those involved in the effort say, they leave the table with the idea that **they must first build** broad **public support before any official will take the issue on.**

Pell Grants are fair.

1. Wiki solves predictability. It’s the TOC. You’ve had 5 months to cut cards.

2. Pell grants are the core of the topic. They’re the primary obstacle to education in the squo. Federal ban on Pell Grants passed because of a retributive mindset. That’s Buzzini 09.

3. Pell grants are the only federal education aff. Any other interp forces me to defend simultaneous 50 state action or private actor fiat which is bad because it’s utopian and not real world. Also kills my ground since no one in the lit defends 50 state action. This also proves I create small limits for the topic.

4. Default to field context to determine T violations. That determines whether the plan is in the lit base. I meet. Pell grants are considered rehab in the lit, and the ban on Pell grants is retributive – that’s Buzzini 09.

5. Plans are key to stable advocacy so neg can’t moot the AC with definitional tricks.

6. Whole rez is incoherent. The state can’t use every competing rehab policy on every prisoner.

7. Prefer aff interpretations. Key to clash. **O’Donnell 4** writes[[27]](#footnote-27)

**AFC preserves the value of the [1AC]** first affirmative constructive speech. **This speech is the starting point for the debate.** It is a function of necessity. The debate must begin somewhere if it is to begin at all. **Failure to grant AFC** is a denial of the service rendered by the affirmative team’s labor when they crafted this speech. Further, if the affirmative does not get to pick the starting point, **[renders] the opening speech** act is essentially rendered **meaningless while the rest of the debate becomes a debate about what we should be debating about.**

Gut check against dumb theory. Competing interps creates a race to the bottom where every round comes down to theory. Intervention is inevitable in blippy theory debates.

Err Aff on theory. This topic is moving towards massive neg bias. Neg won 30% more rounds at NDCA two weeks ago, and 16% more prelims at TOC.

Err towards small schools on theory to account for resource disparity that makes it harder for me to win. This is the last round of your career, and the topic’s been out for 5 months. If no one on PVP has Pell Grants prep, that’s a link to laziness, not fairness.
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